

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 315 325

SO 020 306

TITLE Education for the Future: Addresses from a Public Symposium.

INSTITUTION Texas Committee for the Humanities, Austin.

PUB DATE 89

NOTE 57p.; Presentations from the Texas Committee for the Humanities Public Symposium (Austin, TX, November 14, 1988).

AVAILABLE FROM Texas Committee for the Humanities, 100 Neches Street, Austin, TX 78701 (\$3.00 plus \$1.00 shipping and handling).

PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS Cultural Awareness; *Educational Change; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Financial Support; *Futures (of Society); Global Approach; *Humanities; Postsecondary Education; Quality of Life; Relevance (Education)

IDENTIFIERS *Texas

ABSTRACT

These conference proceedings examine the future of humanities education in Texas and are part of the "Preparing for Texas in the 21st Century Project." The papers presented focused on such critical issues as state support for community sponsored cultural programming and the need for increased citizen understanding of other nations and cultures. The papers included are: (1) "Raising Questions and Opening Minds" (E. Temple); (2) "Education, Citizenship, and Tomorrow's Texas" (A. Richards); (3) "Assessing Educational Reform" (B. Haley); (4) "Educational Priorities in the 21st Century" (W. Delco); (5) "Arts Funding and Quality of Life in Texas" (R. Wallace); (6) "Understanding Other Cultures: The Need for Global Perspective" (F. Abernethy); and (7) "Education for the Future" (J. Veninga). (PPB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED315325

SO 020 346



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

JAMES F.
VENINGA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EDUCATION FOR THE FUTURE

Addresses from a Public Symposium

Texas Committee for the Humanities

EDUCATION FOR THE FUTURE
Addresses from a Public Symposium

Texas Committee for the Humanities

Austin, Texas
November 14, 1988

*© 1989 by Texas Committee for the Humanities, 100 Neches,
Austin, Texas 78701. All rights reserved. Single copies are
available from the publisher at \$3.00 per copy plus \$1.00
shipping and handling.*

Design by O-Tree-O Creations, Austin, Texas.

CONTENTS

Preface	5
Raising Questions and Opening Minds Ellen C. Temple	9
Education, Citizenship, and Tomorrow's Texas Ann W. Richards	13
Assessing Educational Reform Bill Haley	21
Educational Priorities in the 21st Century Wilhelmina Delco	29
Arts Funding and Quality of Life in Texas Ralph Wallace	39
Understanding Other Cultures: The Need for Global Perspective Francis E. Abernethy	47
Education for the Future James F. Veninga	61

PREFACE

On November 14, 1988, the Texas Committee for the Humanities, a state program of the National Endowment for the Humanities, sponsored a public symposium in Austin, Texas, focusing on the future of humanities education in the state. The following edited articles are drawn from the presentations given at the symposium.

This program, which was co-sponsored by the Texas Humanities Alliance, was part of a special three-year project of the Texas Committee for the Humanities, "Preparing for Texas in the 21st Century." This effort, which continues through the fall of 1990, will include a series of publications, numerous local projects funded by the Committee, outreach efforts through a Speakers' Bureau, and other activities designed to heighten citizen awareness of the importance of the humanities to our individual and collective ability to think clearly about the future of Texas.

Although the primary means whereby the Texas Committee for the Humanities has sought to fulfill its mission to advance the study of the humanities has been, since its founding in 1972, that of awarding federal funds to educational and cultural organizations and institutions for public programs, the Committee does initiate and sponsor from time to time particular efforts designed to highlight the contributions that the humanities can make to important and timely public issues. The "Preparing for Texas in the 21st Century" project is one such effort.

In this experiment in civic conversation about the future, reflection on the extent and quality of humanities education in Texas is inevitable. It is also inevitable that such reflection include consideration of broader issues in education and its role in our larger society.

The keynote address, designed to frame the issues, was given by Texas State Treasurer Ann W. Richards. Senator-elect Bill Haley, former Chairman of the House Committee on Public

Education, and a former school teacher, highlighted key issues in elementary and secondary education. Representative Wilhelmina Delco, Chairwoman of the House Committee on Higher Education, and a former member of the board of the Texas Committee for the Humanities, discussed critical issues in postsecondary education. Representative Ralph Wallace, Chairman of the House Committee on Cultural Resources and a long-time advocate of the arts, outlined critical issues in state support for cultural programming sponsored by community organizations.

In developing this three-year project and in setting the agenda for the symposium, the Texas Committee for the Humanities recognized the critical need for increased citizen understanding of other nations and cultures. The concluding address was given by Francis E. Abernethy, Secretary-Editor of the Texas Folklore Society and Professor of English at Stephen F. Austin State University. Abernethy's recent worldwide travels have led to some vitally important and fresh perspectives on this growing concern as it relates to major educational issues.

An Exemplary Project Award in the amount of \$75,000 from the Division of State Programs at the National Endowment for the Humanities made the symposium, as well as other components of the "Texas in the 21st Century" project, possible. The Texas Committee for the Humanities is deeply grateful for this financial support. Division Director Marjorie Berlincourt and Program Officer Brian Mitchell have provided invaluable advice in implementing this project.

Special recognition is due Ellen C. Temple, 1988 Chair of the Texas Committee for the Humanities, and symposium moderator, for her leadership in support of this statewide project. Her comments opening the symposium are included in this volume.

Appreciation is also extended to Kelly Flynn, TCH Program Officer, for her coordination of the symposium, and to Catherine Williams, Editor, *Texas Journal of Ideas, History and Culture*, for

editing the symposium addresses for publication.

Members and staff of the Texas Committee for the Humanities hope that the symposium and this publication will serve as the beginning of ongoing public dialogue on the future of humanities education in the state.

James F. Veninga
Executive Director
Texas Committee for the Humanities

RAISING QUESTIONS AND OPENING MINDS

Ellen C. Temple

As Chair of the Texas Committee for the Humanities, I would like to welcome each of you to this symposium on "Education for the Future." You are a great, enthusiastic group this morning—I think nearly four hundred or so strong. We have teachers and administrators from our public schools and professors from our colleges and universities across the state. We have representatives from our state agencies and from our major cultural and arts institutions, such as the Texas Library Association, the Texas Association of Museums, and the Texas State Historical Association. We have members of our Higher Education Coordinating Board, representatives from the Texas Chamber of Commerce, and representatives from public radio and television stations. We have education advocates from all over this great state. And we are delighted that you are here today.

I think that most of you know what the Texas Committee for the Humanities is and what we do. Our mission is to foster public understanding of and appreciation for the humanities—that is, history, literature, philosophy, foreign languages, and related fields. What do we do to accomplish this mission?

To illustrate, I'd like to tell you about two programs that took place last October in the small town in East Texas where I live. The Museum of East Texas in Lufkin exhibited a show entitled "Five Centuries of Italian Painting." To accompany the art show, the museum received a grant from the Texas Committee for the Humanities to sponsor four lectures. University professors—one from Clarkson University in New York, and the rest from neighboring Stephen F. Austin State University in Nacogdoches—lectured during the month on such topics as "Art and Culture in Renaissance

Italy," "Parallels in Italian Art and Literature," and "Music from the Italian Renaissance." These lectures drew overflow crowds in the small East Texas town; the art show, possibly because of interest generated by the lectures, drew about four thousand visitors. This was a record. Also in October, in an adjoining room of the same museum, the exhibit, *Texas Women: A Celebration of History*, was on view, with editions of local women's history. The exhibit was first made possible through a TCH grant to the Texas Women's History Project way back in 1979. If you magnify these two exhibits, two projects, by hundreds more, you'll have a clear idea of what we do to weave the humanities into the fabric of Texas life.

Today, we're all here to focus on education. With the growing national consensus that our future depends on education, we must ask ourselves: What should that education be like? What should we do? What should we teach? This morning we'll hear from our elected officials who will help us assess the state of education in Texas and share their vision of its future. This afternoon, three committee-appointed study groups will focus on humanities education in the public schools, in our colleges and universities, and in our communities.

The study groups will attempt to answer such questions as these: In the past few decades, there has been an explosion of learning about women's and minority cultures' ideas of history. How successful have we been in incorporating into curricula, textbooks, and classroom study new scholarship on minority cultures and on the history of women? How can such efforts be increased and improved? What opportunities, especially during the summer months, should be given to teachers to deepen their knowledge of their subject matter and to help them keep abreast of what is happening in their fields? There is much emphasis these days from political figures and best-selling authors to restore the Western tradition and Great Books to a more prominent place in the undergraduate curriculum. How do we evaluate this emphasis, and

*"We have a
chance to
open
American
minds,
Texas
minds, to
challenging
possibilities
that lie
ahead."*

what are the merits of current criticism of how the humanities are presently being taught?

The Texas Legislature appropriated sixty million dollars in 1987 to support university research in science and technology, research to support economic development. And each year the U. S. Congress appropriates billions of dollars for university research in science and technology. There is an imbalance between money appropriated for research in these areas and that appropriated for the humanities. What ideas can we develop for increased support for research in the humanities in the years ahead? How can individuals, organizations, and institutions engaged in public humanities programming strengthen collaborative efforts with public schools and colleges and universities?

These are just a few of the questions we'll address this afternoon, and I know that you who attend the sessions have many more of your own. So today we'll just stir the pot a little. This is the time for raising questions and gathering answers together. With this symposium, we can begin a dialogue with our elected leaders who will shape education policy in Texas, and we can also begin a dialogue among all of us who share a passion for the future of humanities education in our state.

I see this day as a great opportunity for us all to assess where we are and to look ahead, to imagine education that enlightens all of our citizens, fostering their minds and bolstering their courage for the challenges that lie ahead. This is an exciting time for humanities education in Texas. We have a chance to open American minds, Texas minds, to challenging possibilities that lie ahead.

EDUCATION, CITIZENSHIP, AND TOMORROW'S TEXAS

Ann W. Richards

It's a delight to be with you. The introduction gives me an opportunity to tell you a story about the last woman who was elected to a statewide office some fifty odd years ago—Ma Ferguson. Some of you here are old enough to remember Ma. She was called "Ma" because she was married to "Pa" Ferguson. When Pa, the Governor of Texas, got himself into a tad of trouble and was impeached, Ma replaced him as Governor. But the important thing for you to know about Ma was her remark when confronted with the question of whether children should be punished for speaking Spanish in the public schools of Texas. Ma said that if the English language was good enough for Jesus Christ, it was good enough for the children of Texas. So I know it's reassuring to you to learn that women have learned something over the last fifty years!

Years ago, I heard another wonderful story about a boy growing up on a farm in the deep South. When it came time to begin school, he tested out at genius level. Of course, the local educational establishment was delighted because geniuses were not a common occurrence in that little town. And he breezed through the public schools, finishing early with every honor there was to bestow. Attention came easily to him, and he went on to college and graduate work with a series of scholarships. He ended up working on his Ph.D. in philosophy at one of the most prestigious of the northeastern schools.

Demonstrating true brilliance, he was the darling of his professors, who treated him more like a colleague than a student. There was a tremendous sense of excitement about what he was going to accomplish; and as he was nearing the end of his graduate studies, the president of the university called the young man to his office for

a talk. He explained to the student that all sorts of dazzling and exciting offers would just be pouring in, and he felt that the young man must choose very, very carefully. Teaching, research—his choice would have a great consequence on his life. The young man looked at him for a moment and said that he had already made his choice: he intended to do just what he had always wanted to do, to go back to his home to run his family farm. Well, the president was simply aghast. Twenty years of schooling, scholarships, the devotion of his tutors, tremendous expectations for his success—all this for nothing?

"Why on earth," asked the president, "would you go through all of this, if the only thing you wanted to do was to work a farm in the cultural backwater?"

"Well," said the young man, "to tell you the truth, I wanted something to think about while I was plowing."

I've never known whether that story is true, but I've always hoped that it is. It is such a wonderful tribute to the joy of learning, to the personal nature of education, to the cultivation of the mind for the pure pleasure of thought. What a tremendous extravagance it seems in our contemporary times, when we are concerned that our educational perspective has narrowed to the utilitarian and the mundane, when discussion of education lingers longest when you are talking about job training!

If you listen long enough, it begins to seem that education has become nothing more than another economic development tool. But the truth of the matter is that from our nation's beginning we've always been a little uncertain about the true value of education. We've never been particularly devoted to the cultivation of an educational elite in this country. How well I remember the distrust of Adlai Stevenson's brains and erudition! As a democracy, we have told ourselves that an informed and educated citizenry is essential to our survival; but it was very late in our history that the public schools taught anything more than just the basics of

*"A sound
basic
education
is about
thinking
and
reasoning
and growth
and grasp-
ing the
underlying
values in
life and
society."*

literacy. Education for us has always seemed important for what it can buy. We want our children to get a good education so they can be successful. We tell the poor that schooling is the way up and out of poverty. We tend to fret about our schools only when we think they are short-changing us economically.

Concern about cultural literacy may be selling books right now, but our deeper concern is the high school graduate who cannot read a job application, or the young executive who cannot write a coherent sentence in the annual report. And we are right to be deeply concerned. The materials you have received in anticipation of this conference lay out our shortcomings in basic education very, very clearly. At least ten percent of our population is functionally illiterate, and the figure leaps to almost twenty-five percent for those whose literacy is borderline. I was really staggered when I was driving back from San Antonio the other day and stopped at a MacDonald's or a Burger King to get something to drink; I noticed that instead of numbers or letters on the cashier's machine, there were pictures. I asked the clerk why they were putting pictures there, and she said, "Well, it was so that they would know what to charge for."

This story tells very succinctly, I think, about what is happening to the functionally illiterate in this society and about the costly accommodation business has had to make to survive. Roughly thirteen percent of all seventeen-year-olds are functionally illiterate. And among minority young people the figure is as high as forty percent. In Texas, our high school drop-out rates in parts of South Texas and in some urban areas run as high as fifty percent.

As a society we pay a high cost for the people behind these figures. Chronically high unemployment along the border and in our inner cities, prisons bulging with inmates who never finished the eighth grade—a rising tide of evidence suggests the creation of an underclass of Americans whose alienation from the larger society is greater than anything we have experienced in our history.

Aside from the tremendous personal waste of these unhappy situations, the cost of the long-run financial and spiritual drain on our entire society is really incalculable. And as we sit here today pondering the quality of education for the next century, contemplating the need to enrich the education available to our children, we need to be reminded that the reclamation of those who have not mastered even the basics of literacy must be a top priority. Both our financial and our innovative thinking must be directed at assuring the literacy of all of our people; and I hope very much that you will apply your trained brains to the problem and be as creative and as innovative as you possibly can in your suggestions.

Given the literacy problem, we do have to get back to basics. Having said that, however, I strongly believe we must also broaden our definition of basic education, because a basic education is about more than the three Rs and higher multiple test scores. A sound basic education is about thinking and reasoning and growth and grasping the underlying values in life and society.

The "L word" is currently taking a beating in the political arena, but it has taken a beating in our schools and colleges for years. The idea of pursuing a liberal education—one grounded in the humanities—has for a time seemed almost a quaint notion. The schools of business and law and engineering drew more and more of our best students, focusing on earning potential and education as training for higher-paying jobs. Humanities courses came to be thought of as an extraneous pursuit and unproductive—just a lot of thinking and contemplation, nothing that would add to a paycheck. But when our secondary schools, colleges, and universities dropped humanities requirements from their core curricula and cut money back in those departments, we found that serious problems resulted. Our medical schools now find it necessary to teach courses in "human interaction"—in how to treat a patient like a human being instead of a collection of symptoms. And our

business and law schools have found it necessary to teach "remedial ethics."

I must tell you, as an aside, that it occurred to me one day that if we did a little brush-up on ethics, as we do on computer skills or secretarial skills or management skills, perhaps a situation like Watergate would never have occurred. Maybe if Mr. Nixon had called in his staff and said, "Boys, today we're all gonna talk about ethics," we would have indeed seen a change in the course of American history. We tried this at the Treasury several months ago. When we brought in all of the employees they were scared to death, of course, because they thought we were going to talk about the legal pads or pens that had somehow made their way home! Interestingly enough, however, it was one of the most stimulating seminars we have had since I have become Treasurer: there was really an outpouring on the part of the employees on questions about difficult ethical situations they had confronted.

So perhaps a little reminder about ethics is a good idea. But isn't it a shame that we have not done the job from the very beginning? I think of all of the remedial help we need in many areas of our complex modern life as well. Whenever, for example, I try to master what once were simple kitchen appliances or interact with the mystical contraption automobiles have become, I always hope that our engineering schools will begin to teach courses on how real people use the products that these budding geniuses design!

Well, maybe the problems would still be there if the humanities still enjoyed their old place of prominence in secondary and undergraduate schools. But I can't help thinking that somehow the problems would not be so pronounced, and I believe we're beginning to be more aware of these connections. Nevertheless, many of our policy makers find it difficult to understand the connections; when your focus is on the creation of a skilled work force, you may not think first of the humanities. But I think we will develop that understanding. The current emphasis on education as economic develop-

ment can work to our advantage; it may, in fact, work to give us the leverage to bring a liberal education and the humanities back to center stage.

Business Week magazine has observed that it is the higher order skills—reasoning, mastering new complex concepts, expressing thoughts in well written prose—that a sophisticated economy increasingly needs. And these are the skills the humanities teach best. The fact of the matter is that the population we need to develop must not only be technically skilled; it must also be comfortable with change and new ways of learning. Studies are telling us now that the younger working generation will change careers, not just jobs, as frequently as five times during their lifetime because the marketplace is going to demand it. The emphasis will be on flexibility, on adapting to change, on reasoning out new ways of working, on learning to integrate new experiences or skills. The workers who succeed in this environment will be those who can think, whose agility of mind is developed early by teachers in subject matter that challenges them on a personal level, who require more than the immediate and the utilitarian.

Rutherford Rogers, the Yale librarian, has said that we are drowning in information and starving for knowledge. And the kind of knowledge we will most need in the 21st century is that which helps us reason with all this information. Our schools must encourage students to understand that acquiring knowledge is a lifetime vocation that allows us to prosper in our work and in our living. Today that young man who spent twenty years of school to have something to think about while he was plowing would need his education for more than mental calisthenics. He would need a well tutored mind to imagine and discover new ways to make his farm profitable, to apply new technologies, to work his farm with intelligence as well as strength, to be able to express his problems and his needs to his elected officials in Washington, to write articulate letters to those who indeed have a direct effect on what happens on that farm.

"Our schools must encourage students to understand that acquiring knowledge is a lifetime vocation that allows us to prosper in our work and in our living."

Today, as you undertake the work of this symposium, your challenge is to show us, the policy makers, how we can literally put the humanities back to work for all of us. Give us the tools with which to carry the message to the other end of Congress Avenue. We need your help and your insight and your patience; we need your perspective.

Most of you know that one of my greatest friends in politics and in my personal life is the Lieutenant Governor, Bill Hobby. It's always interesting to get on a plane with Bill. While other people may be leafing through a text given to them by their staff, or glancing through the "Newsmakers" section of *Newsweek*, Bill Hobby is working difficult crossword puzzles. This says a great deal about the man and about the kind of policy makers we must have in this state—that is, people who never tire of meaningful exercise in learning.

And so your efforts to bring us along may sometimes be frustrating and difficult; but there are those in the Capitol who are listening. I think the times are on your side because we are once again learning that the humanities are not ivory tower wool-gathering; they are the most practical and the most vital disciplines we must have for our future.

ASSESSING EDUCATIONAL REFORM

Bill Haley

I very much appreciate being invited to discuss what I think will be some major issues we will be facing in education between now and the turn of the century.

Public school reform in this state, and perhaps in the nation, began in 1981, with House Bill 246, called the School Reform Bill. Now, let me tell you why. Unlike House Bill 72, which is more technical in its approach to education, HB 246 addressed the *philosophy* of public education and curricular reform. It erased the four or five pages we had in the law for curriculum, a hodge-podge the Legislature put in from time to time, much of which came following World War I and World War II. Although well-meaning, and something of which we could be proud, its emphasis was predominantly patriotic rather than educational. One section of the law before House Bill 246, for example, mandated teaching ten minutes of "intellectual patriotism" daily. Under science, it stated that we must teach "respect for birds, their nests, and their eggs." From that, somehow, over the years, we managed to come up with a curriculum. In the mid-1970s, however, we began to realize where this way of dealing with the curriculum had led us in Texas, and where it had led the nation in general: ours was a nation who graduated students, for all practical purposes, illiterate.

The new curriculum listed eleven basic subject areas. Wilhelmina Delco had worked admirably on it, and almost had it done the year before, when an unfortunate set of circumstances occurred. The fine arts people believed that they were being cut totally from the curriculum; and by the time we could straighten that out, the session had ended. So we had another study of it, and it fell to me to carry the piece of legislation that finally passed, but for which Wilhelmina

deserves a tremendous amount of credit.

The result was a little four-page bill which took the issue out of the hands of the Legislature and put curriculum back into the hands of the educators—the Texas Education Agency, the State Board of Education, and the local school districts—to determine, expand, and build a curriculum based on eleven subject areas, rather than on specific requirements in the law as to what each subject should or should not be. Educators could then expand the curriculum as time went by and be able to include the changes that had occurred from 1949 to 1981, or ones that would occur from 1981 to the year 2015. And who knows what curriculum changes will be appropriate by that time?

Again, however, we ran into another problem which almost destroyed our efforts—the intervention of an extraordinarily conservative group which, because we did not specifically list American history and government, considered the bill a Communist plot. The group claimed that we were trying to stop the teaching of Democracy in the public schools, notwithstanding the fact that an American history teacher of twelve-and-a-half years was carrying the bill. So we added a twelfth subject area. Although we already had social studies as one area, we nevertheless added American history and government as a separate field. So now the curriculum in the law sets out twelve basic subject areas and leaves it to the State Board of Education and the local school boards to develop the curriculum—as time goes by, without the interference of politicians and the Legislature. This development was, I think, the most significant step toward public school reform in this state since Gilmer Aiken's efforts in the 1940s.

And then in 1983 came House Bill 72, which took a different approach. The now familiar mandates, such as the "no pass-no play" rule and the teacher-student ratio requirement of one-to-twenty-two in the elementary schools, were a part of this approach. What happens in the next ten years? Where is public education now? Do we stop, take a great sigh, and say, "Thank

goodness we're through for a while, until it's time for the next Gilmer Aiken, or the next House Bill 72"?

The time will come when we will have the "next" Gilmer Aiken or House Bill 72; but it must not come because we feel we are where we ought to be when that occurs. It ought to come because we will have expanded the law to the point that it will no longer expand; and that's exactly what we were doing in House Bill 72. We had stretched Gilmer Aiken to the point that there wasn't any stretch left in it. Now we had to do a whole new sequence from which to begin stretching, so that the curriculum could once again do for education what it should do.

In the process, however, we're going to run into some serious problems; and one we already face is testing. Testing. There are those who believe that the TEAMS tests, tests at each grade level, and exit tests in the twelfth grade accurately measure learning. There are those who believe that these tests should drive the curriculum K-12, and then on into college. Let me tell you, this belief will be the downfall of all education reform. Already teachers are merely teaching the test. The two of us full-time teachers in the House of Representatives tried to explain: Wait a minute, yes, we do need assessment, no question about it. But when you begin to assess at such intervals as we are now and begin to judge everything on that assessment, to believe the test results will tell us exactly how much education a student has, then not only do you know nothing about education, you're also totally destroying any progress.

We can be able to assess the degree to which students five, ten, fifteen years from now will be doing better than students now. But it's going to be rough. It's going to take a tremendous amount of effort because we will have to go back to the *curriculum*—to compare the curriculum now to the curriculum two years ago, four years ago, and ten years ago, when we saw the problem really coming. And I can tell you what we will find. If we're fortunate today, tomorrow, five years from now, we will find textbooks at a grade

reading level much higher than they are today. We will find teachers teaching at a much higher level at the ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades than they are today, or were five years or ten years ago.

But the test is not going to do that. The test is going to mean merely that we will prepare students for the test. And this awful, hideous, insidious notion that a test should determine how well a school district is paid, how well it is funded by the state—as if the test will show how well the district is educating—is absolutely the most pathetic notion that has ever hit the Legislature. In my estimation it will constitute, and I mean this sincerely, a sin toward the future of this state, which is our children. This testing business must necessarily “fad out” quickly. Texas citizens absolutely must convince their legislators that some type of achievement test at many levels is good, but that it must be drawn up by those who are teaching. Otherwise teachers will not be teaching, but merely preparing students for tests.

Do you know how the Texas Education Agency deals with the teachers now? They tell teachers the four or five elements of each subject in the curriculum that will be on the test. In order to expand that, they say, “Well, from now on we’ll tell them the six or seven things that *may* be on it.” What they’re not telling the teachers is the fifteen or twenty elements that should be *taught* in that subject, in that period of time. If teachers, for example, have a language arts course which has twenty elements to be taught, they may now expand their teaching to eight or nine elements from the four they’re currently told about. So now they plug in at eight or nine and skip the others until the test is over—and then they ram these other areas through.

Something must be done. We are teaching all kinds of good test-taking techniques; our kids come out of school, go into industry, and take tests to determine whether they are capable of success there. They knock the top out of those tests and go to work for people. But the people

“In assessing our educational goals, we must assess our philosophy of education and take seriously what we are trying to accomplish in the broadest sense of the word.”

that hire them think, "My God, what is wrong? Can't you think?"

They don't have to think; they never had to. There are people who would listen to the Legislature and say: "Give me a test to show me that our students are learning." Or: "Our school got an extra million dollars based on our test scores four years ago; our children must be learning." But such educational misconceptions are like misperceiving the difference between the methodology and the philosophy of one's religion. In assessing our educational goals, we must assess our philosophy of education and take seriously what we are trying to accomplish in the broadest sense of the word.

First grade through twelve. I think we are going to see a restructuring at the high school level. I think the twelfth grade, as we know it, is about to become archaic; it has been archaic, let me assure you, for some time—for the simple reason that the vast majority of our students have not been capable of mastering the twelfth grade. That's the reason for HB 246 and HB 72. But it's going to be archaic for other reasons as well, and I think the twelfth grade will serve different functions from what it does today. It may, for example, be there for students who lack a little bit finishing their certificate to practice auto mechanics, refrigeration, hair styling, or other vocational areas. Or, for those kids who are simply not going to college, it may provide them with one or two more courses in something they need or want before winding up their formal education. For some of those who are going to college, the twelfth year may be unnecessary; other college-bound students may want the extra year for extra maturation, physical, mental, social, or academic. And it will be there for them. The gifted and talented students may opt out even earlier than the eleventh grade, or they may choose to stay and take their time to move through.

The idea that high school is four years, that college is four years, that the Masters is the next three, the Ph.D. the next three must come to an end if we are to serve the democracy. We have to

offer more flexibility; we have to be able to move to a system serving that kind of flexibility. And that is where I think the twelfth grade belongs in the system—in a year-round school, in which a student begins the first grade, and if he is ready for college in ten years, he will go; if he is ready in twenty, he will experience no stigma. Year-round schools? We tried that once, but nobody ever knew it: it was called the "quarter system" because every single school district in the state took the summer quarter off and made everything work to that end!

Definition. Not one of you here can give me the definition of a "school district." I cannot give you that definition because it does not exist in the law. What exists in the law is the definition merely of the technical aspects of forming or dissolving or merging school districts. You can go to Chapter Nineteen of the education code, and it will tell you exactly how to form a school district—what you must have, how you must vote, how you designate the tax structure, how you merge school districts, how you dissolve a school district. But define a school district? Define what it must be able to do for its citizens? Define what it must be able to do with the taxpayers' money? Define what it must be able to do for the students, for the teachers? The answers to these questions do not exist. You have to get into a philosophical argument with somebody to have any notion of how these questions need to be answered.

Definition of a school district? Judge Clark is forcing us into that; and that is fine with me. I don't want to lose my money, but we're being forced into definition. This will be the ultimate consequence most people—particularly politicians—have yet to see in the Clark decision. But that's because we have to scramble over the tax aspect of school districts. Definition is what we're going to see.

I would like to comment briefly on a final topic. Our philosophy of education, particularly in Texas, is based on the tenet that we will educate everyone to the best of his or her ability. I support that wholeheartedly, almost as one of

the ten amendments of the Constitution. So we do that. We have one group which we call "special education"; we have another group which is "all the folks"; and we have a third group which is "all the folks including the little group up here which is called the gifted and talented." What are we going to do for the gifted and talented in the next ten years?

Very little. It's easy not to do much for them: they'll educate themselves; they can take care of themselves, we say. It's like pulling teeth to get these children the five million dollars we've gotten them since I've been here, since 1978. Gifted and talented. We ought to be spending thirty percent of our revenue from the local and state level on the gifted and talented. Can you imagine where we would be if we valued these citizens as we should? It's incomprehensible where we would be. What is far, far more important than worrying about education-code formula to keep local taxes down is concerning ourselves with formula to appropriate money for gifted and talented students from kindergarten through the twelfth grade—from kindergarten through the Ph.D.

Well, these are just some of the important issues. We in the Texas Legislature face them at a different level than you do: we punch the red and green buttons.

EDUCATIONAL PRIORITIES IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Wilhelmina Delco

I served my first two terms in the Legislature on the House Committee on Public Education; it seemed natural to do that after I'd been on the Austin School Board. As a matter of fact, the reason I chose to run for the Legislature was because of the Rodriguez decision that said the state was finally going to do something about equalizing education in the state of Texas. In my naiveté, I thought I'd run up to the Legislature for two years, get that out of the way, and then do something else important. Well, we clearly have not resolved this issue, as *Edgewood vs. Kirby* strongly implies. We are still wrestling with what we should do in the name of quality, equality, and equal opportunity for the people in this state who pay over half of their state tax dollars on education.

When I left the Committee on Public Education to chair the Committee on Higher Education, I had some resentment because I felt that the House ought to be like the Senate in not compartmentalizing education. It seemed logical to me that we ought to have one committee that looks literally from kindergarten through post-graduate education. Now, however, with my experience of having served on both committees, I honestly believe our House situation is better. In the Senate, somebody seems to get lost in the shuffle: in one session it's public education; in the next session it's higher education. It's very difficult to have sustained advocacy for both groups.

In the Public Education Committee, it seems that the minute a bill is produced or a report is issued, we clone 150 "experts." Everybody gets to know everything there is to know about public education—as soon as we turn that document to our districts and see whether we get money or lose money. That's how we determine whether

it's a good bill or a bad bill. In higher education the problem is a little different.

In Texas we believe in a concept called local control, in which a publicly elected school board has the authority to levy taxes. Therefore the assumption is that people in a local community have some say over what's going to happen in their public schools. Now, I'm not going to argue with how realistic, or even how honest, that is, but that is at least the perception. When you get to higher education, the state of Texas has thirty-seven senior-level institutions of higher education. We have forty-nine community colleges on sixty campuses; we have four campuses of Texas State Technical Institute, which is our more sophisticated form of vocational technical education; and we have professional schools of varying degrees housed in some of our multiversities, universities that go from the baccalaureate all the way up to post-doctoral and professional degrees. We also have a number, I think at last count it was forty-eight, private colleges and universities. They participate in state education to some extent through a program called Tuition Equalization Grants, giving students, to a limited degree, a choice between private and public education.

Now after all the publicity and spotlight that House Bill 72 generated in the Legislature and in the state, it was a natural consequence to assume that if it's good to reform public education, we really ought to see how good it would be to reform post-secondary education. So a resolution was passed and a committee formed—the Select Committee on Higher Education—that proceeded to do precisely that. By and large its philosophy for reforming public education was that there is something dramatically wrong. The general consensus was that our kids can't read, that we're spending a lot of money, and that we don't really know what we're getting for the money we're spending. The question was what we can do to correct this problem. And so the full intent was to find out what was wrong, assuming there was something wrong, and to spend money to correct it.

*"We are
learning
the hard
way in
Texas that
our only
really
renewable
resource is
the minds
of our
people."*

When the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, and the Speaker of the House addressed the Select Committee on Higher Education, their focus was on fine-tuning a vehicle that was already working—to most people's impression, anyway—fairly well in Texas. And instead of talking about how you put more money in to improve this enterprise we call higher education, the sounding call was how can we can "cut out the fat." The perception was that there was a great deal of money in higher education fostering layers and layers of what we call "administrivia": more and more people doing less and less. Little attention had been given to some of the major problems on our campuses. Few people, for example, realized that in some college and university departments there were faculty who "knew all there was to know" generally and had now proceeded down to specifics in the absurd. It wasn't enough to have an English professor be an expert on Shakespeare—even an expert on Shakespeare's tragedies, as opposed to Shakespeare's comedies—but an expert on Shakespeare's *early* tragedies or Shakespeare's tragic *heroines*. Students, after all, were really there to focus on how they could write a highly specialized Ph.D. dissertation!

So we launched an enterprise to look at higher education in order to determine where this state ought to be moving. At the time, Texas was beginning to face some serious economic and financial problems. The businesspeople who made up the majority of the committee were convinced that we would have to use our system of education as one of the principal vehicles for economic development and world-wide competition. As you know, the Committee on Public Education was headed by one of our better-known billionaires, so the Select Committee on Higher Education came to be, at least conceptually, not the Perot *committee*, but the *son* of Perot. Well, I believe that Perot didn't really know anything about this son; and so our job on the Select Committee on Higher Education was to try to improve the higher education system while being sensitive to long-range economic

needs.

In the case of the liberal arts—the humanities, if you will—our goal was not to become high-class vocational-technical schools; we wanted instead to maintain the concept of an *educated person*, a well-rounded educated person. And that's not easy to do because in higher education the funding is based on warm bodies. When you have funding based on warm bodies, the problem is that, since the eighteen-to-twenty-two-year-old population is declining—as it is doing in Texas and all over this country—then you have to reach further afield, looking for the exotic to attract people who aren't the "normal," or perceived normal, clientele for post-secondary education. Consequently, more and more specific offerings were developed, farther and farther from the main campuses of our institutions, in order to fund this enterprise we call the higher education in Texas. Competing with this concept makes an interesting challenge for a group looking for an enterprise to do two things: (1) to educate a literate constituency for citizenship, for the fullest participation in the highest possible quality of life, and (2) to make *taxpayers* out of these *tax eaters*. According to this group, education should function to help teach the kinds of skills that will help people earn the kinds of living that will pay the kinds of taxes that will make Texas—our Texas—what we all want it to be.

Well, that's not easy. But our efforts resulted in a number of consequences designed to improve higher education. The first was that the recommendations of the Select Committee were translated into a series of laws. The initial recommendation was a kind of master plan, a grand design, a long-range plan for higher education that, for the first time in the history of this state, made the statement that higher education is important in Texas. It further acknowledged that education is an enterprise worthy not only of our participation, but of our investment: that, in fact, if we were going to do what needed to be done in higher education, alas and alack, it was indeed going to cost money. The second was the

acknowledgement that we have a responsibility to keep the balance between liberal arts—the humanities—and the ever-growing pursuit toward technological research, toward vocational skills, and toward the kinds of offerings we use to entice folks into higher education. And it acknowledged, as well, that going to college is directly related to earning potential.

We also felt that, in regard to our national competition on a world-wide economic market, it is important to realize that we would never be able to recapture the jobs that have already been lost to Third-World countries. Our folks are not willing to work for these wages and are increasingly unwilling to do these kinds of very menial, monotonous jobs. What we needed to do—and what our institutions of higher education could very well help us to do—was, through the vehicle of research, to develop new jobs with the technical edge we had enjoyed for so long in the United States. So a major component of our Higher Education Select Committee was to emphasize research.

Now one of the problems that is unique to, or at least obvious in, Texas is the nature of our growing and changing population. By the year 2010 our population will be almost majority minority—it certainly will be in all of our urban areas. The fastest growing populations in Texas are Black and Brown. At the same time, these populations also represent the most undereducated, the most underutilized, underserved, and undermotivated in our state. As one of our former governors said, agriculture has come and diminished, and oil and gas have now come and, to a substantial degree, diminished as well. We are learning the hard way in Texas that our only really renewable resource is the minds of our people.

We can no longer afford to throw away the promise of our Black and Brown youngsters by saying, "OK, we'll build more jails and try to put a few more dimes into welfare, and then we'll concentrate on the talented tenth in our population." It's good to concentrate on the talented tenth; there is no question that we will need the

brightest and the best among us. But I will argue that a kid at age three who can go into the supermarket and figure out every single cereal that has sugar *and* a prize can learn to read. I will also argue that, realistically, it's easier and cheaper to educate than to incarcerate. We cannot afford the luxury of polarizing our society.

And so it is going to be critically important to us to take seriously the recommendations of all our legislative committees that are wrestling with these problems and try to find a way to involve all of our people in the positive aspects of education, instead of the negative ones—because, you see, our kids are going to learn anyway. If they don't learn how to build houses, they are going to perfect the art of breaking in to them. If they don't learn how to work in banks, they surely will learn how to rip them off.

Education for us has to be an enterprise well worth the expenditure. As we face the 21st century in Texas, we must recognize that we all have a stake in the education of all our children. To understand the "all," let me remind you of another statistic in Texas. The average age of Hispanic women is twenty-one plus; of Black women, twenty-four plus; and of white women, twenty-nine plus. It doesn't take a genius to figure out who is having the babies.

At the same time, we also need to recognize that the other fastest growing population in our state and in the United States is people over sixty-five. A thousand new people every year greet their hundredth birthday, and the number is increasing every day. Now the problem this creates, the one we will have to address from a legislative perspective, is the response of people who are saying, "I have already educated my children; I have provided for the education of my grandchildren; now I want my tax dollars to work for me. I want some of the benefits that will enhance the quality of *my* life in my last years. I want to be able to go back to continuing education and take the Spanish or the powder-puff mechanics I always wanted to take, even if this displaces one of those kids who is going there to collect major financial aid." It's important for us

"Can we establish the priorities that will put the biggest bucks where we get, if you will, the biggest bang? I would argue forcefully that this is education."

to get all of our communities working together, committed to education; if we don't we're going to set up a polarization that will pit one group against another. And we cannot afford that.

One of the fearful consequences of Judge Clark's decision is the perception that "nothing is broke, we don't need to fix anything," that if we just ratify in the Constitution what we are already doing, it will be all right. On the contrary, we have many school districts, many kids, many communities that are going to need more, not less, help. We have many youngsters we must—in the name of equal education—provide more for. In the 21st century, if we're going to be a leader instead of the largest Third-World country on the earth, it's an investment we will have to make. We must get our priorities together and make the investment that will help us do the job that needs to be done.

The Select Committee on Higher Education has said that there are a number of ways to do this. We were concerned that teachers were learning about how to teach, more than about what to teach. And so we said that on the baccalaureate level, the degree in education would be abolished, except for an interdisciplinary degree applied almost exclusively to primary teachers who would teach across a number of subjects. We said that we will not continue to perpetrate fraud on our young people by giving them a high school diploma that translates into nothing when they get to college.

We said it is important for young people to have mastered basic skills. Well, we don't know any way to determine whether they have mastered basic skills unless we test for those basic skills; and so now all youngsters who have met every other criterion an institution wishes to impose for admission will be tested after they are admitted. Our philosophy is not that testing is for punishment but for placement, for the purpose of determining where students are and what they need. If a young person is deficient in a skill that is critical to becoming college educated, then the institution has the responsibility to help that student correct the deficiency before

he or she can go beyond sixty credit hours.

We also said that research is important, not just for the multiversities, but for all our colleges and universities. Since it is important, we ought to make funds available through free and open competition by application, with awards being determined through peer review undertaken by a group outside Texas. In addition, we thought it is important not only to have the pure research but to fund applied research as well, as this research could translate into the job market.

We also felt that it is important to say—over and over again—that *education is important in Texas*. It's important for all Texans. And it's important to all Texans that our systems of education be available literally from the cradle to the grave—that if you never finished, if you started and then stopped, there would always be respectable and rewardable reentries into education. We already have a whole system, called community colleges, that tries very well to address this issue. But our challenge in the next session of the Legislature is to keep this goal a priority, when we are truly being sniped at for not putting equalization money sufficiently into education, to define these districts, and to fund them. But when we're also in court over prisons, when we're also in court over mental health and mental retardation, and services to our populations with special needs, the dilemma is always that there is never enough money to do it all. Can we establish the priorities that will put the biggest bucks where we get, if you will, the biggest bang? I would argue forcefully that this is education.

I served on a Carnegie governor's panel that was looking at the influence of business in education. The last chapter of that study deals with the "ivory-covered corporation" and the creeping fear that if we as taxpayers are not willing to put the necessary money into the enterprise we call education, then business will. But what will it cost us? Are we, now, willing to have businesses endowing chairs, endowing educational institutions, with specific strings attached? Can we afford to do that? Can we, in the name of what

*"It is
critically
important
that we
define what
we mean by
education,
and that we
fund what
we define."*

is beginning to work so well in Texas—the partnership of business and government and educational institutions? Can this partnership continue to work equally for all of us, or will one side tip it too far?

These are the kinds of questions challenging us as we move toward the 21st century, questions we must ask. It is critically important that we define what we mean by education, and that we fund what we define.

ARTS FUNDING AND QUALITY OF LIFE IN TEXAS

Ralph Wallace

Part of my purpose here is to provide a "wrap up" and to forecast some of the short-term and long-range goals, problems, and issues we will be facing in the next legislative session.

We'll need help in the next session of the Legislature to fight the battle of funding for the arts. As you know, last year the battle was pretty tough. I then had the privilege and the honor of leading a delegation of southern representatives and senators to Mainland China, on the first direct cultural exchange visit exclusively from the southern United States. While we were in China, my colleagues in the Texas House eliminated the Texas Commission on the Arts' funding! It was imperative, of course, that I return to Texas almost immediately. This is the kind of problem we can expect.

I want to make a strong and serious point here: on the Clark decision concerning public education, I can assure you that a simple ratification of a constitutional amendment would be whitewashing the problem and skirting our responsibility as duly elected representatives of this state. If the federal courts would then intervene and declare it unconstitutional, we'd have the same problem with public education that we do with the prison system here in this state—I can assure you that. If your representatives think that they can simply skirt the serious problem of equal education for all the citizens in this state by a simple-worded constitution, they're wrong; it just doesn't work that way.

In most of the committees and agencies I oversee, the major problem we have each session is funding. There are three major short-range and long-term problems: money, money, and money. And I'll need your help, especially when it comes down to making the determination in the next session of the Legislature whether the

Texas Commission on the Arts is going to remain a separate and independent agency, or whether it will come under the umbrella of another agency. Legislation will be introduced to try to combine that agency, as we did with the Film Commission which was brought under the Economic Development Commission. It will be a tough battle in this next session to maintain the agency's independence.

If we can maintain an independent agency in the Arts Commission, we'll need to develop and expand our initiatives in the area of arts in education. The visiting artist program, for example, is extremely important in public education. When you look to the arts, you look to freedom of expression. There are very few ways in which we allow our children to deviate from the norms and the strict standards constantly imposed on them. The freedom of expression provided by the arts is one healthy and constructive way our students can deviate without turning to other means, particularly the drug culture which is enveloping our schools.

One major problem is that the general population does not understand the significance of the arts in our society. And believe me, the problem is shared by our colleagues in the Texas House. We need funding for the arts in this state. What we are talking about is simple: concern for quality of life. What should also be apparent is the connection among the arts, quality of life, and economic development. If we want to attract businesses to our state, we need to be fostering those institutions that serve the cultural constituency: museums, libraries, cultural organizations and institutions. If we don't have those institutions, we won't get new businesses. Other states *have* made commitments to quality of life and cultural arts programs, and these states will beat us in our bid for economic development because we haven't taken care of our business at home—taking care of the education of our people through the maintenance of our cultural institutions.

The economic impact of cultural funding has not yet gotten home to most of the members of the

"The freedom of expression provided by the arts is one healthy and constructive way our students can deviate without turning to other means...."

Texas Legislature. Their commitment to this funding, however, is important to the entire citizenry. And it is important for them to remember this: they'll not be defeated in the Texas House if they vote *for* arts funding, and they'll not be defeated if they vote *against* arts funding. This is not a campaign issue; it's a nonpartisan issue, a quality of life issue. Let's keep it on this level.

Another argument for increased arts funding stems from our nationwide ranking—Texas is at the very bottom. Why are all the other states above us? And internationally. Why, when you go to foreign countries, do you see not commissioners, but *ministers* of culture? Just last spring I spent four weeks in the European Visitors Program, during which time I visited with the cultural ministers of eight European countries, in addition to this summer's East Rim cultural mission to Taiwan, China, and Japan. The level of funding and the level of commitment these countries have made to their cultural programs makes us wonder: What have we done wrong? Is it simply that we're not old enough yet as a state and a nation to appreciate our history, our roots?

Government and cultural representatives in these countries wanted to learn something from me, and I wanted to learn something from them. They wanted to know how corporations and foundations play such a major role in funding large programs in this country and how they could start setting up corporate sponsorships. Corporate sponsorships in Mainland China? I went to the first ballet in Mainland China that ever had a corporate sponsor.

What I tried to learn from them was how they are able to convince the *government* that it should play such a major funding role in arts programming. In Texas, I'll tell you very frankly, the funding level is just too damn low. Texas is the eighth largest economic power on this planet. Think about that for a moment—and then think about our commitment to arts funding. We must develop the rationale for prioritizing cultural funding as other states and countries have done

and start instilling in our own elected officials the logic behind our increased commitment to our cultural organizations.

Now I would like to make some brief points on the agencies in particular, and on some problems I envision in the next session of the Legislature. In the area of libraries and archives, there is fortunately a major federal matching grant program in place. The reason we were able to keep cuts from the Library and Archives Commission was that if we went below a certain funding level, we lost a tremendous amount of money. I told my colleagues: "If you cut one dollar out of that budget we'll lose ten million dollars in federal funding. Now what's the economic impact of that?" We did hold the line in funding in this area, although document preservation costs are great.

The answer to museums is not the line item veto that Governor Clements exercised with the Sam Houston Memorial Museum and the Panhandle Plains Museum. If we're going to make these institutions independent or self-sufficient, we can't do it by slitting their throats and cutting them off completely. I do agree that we need to establish foundations to try to support some of our museums and libraries. The Sam Houston Memorial Museum, for example, is trying to establish a foundation to support itself. I recall that when Governor Clements made that veto, Sam Houston IV called me at home on a Sunday night. Because of the Governor's decision, Houston was considering removing many of his own historical collections from the museum. I encouraged him not to, as I thought that the funding for this museum could be corrected in the next session of the Legislature. The story, nevertheless, illustrates the problems created by the line-item veto.

On the State Preservation Board, we're going to have to make a commitment to use general revenue funds to pay for Capitol restoration. We cannot wait any longer. We have one of the most beautiful capitols in the nation. You and I know that in this time of recession it is doubtful that we can raise \$120 million from corporations when

there is so much competition for corporate dollars; so I will be recommending in the next legislative session that the money be drawn out of the general revenue fund. It will be a tough move, but I am going to fight for it. Two years ago we looked at Capitol restoration, and if that building had been burned, we couldn't have rebuilt it. We didn't even have any architectural plans for it. We must better protect our past. We almost lost one of our greatest buildings in the United States not too long ago because the fire system in that facility is outdated and needs to be replaced. We have to make this commitment.

In regard to the Texas Historical Commission, I think we made a mistake in the Texas Legislature last year when we imposed a sales tax on historical renovations. This tax needs to be repealed; it's double taxation. We need to repair property; we need to improve its value. We'll be improving its value on the tax rolls anyway. But what I have seen in the last two years is many historical restoration projects stopped in this state because of the tax imposition, and that's costing us money. The historical aspects of the state are the number-one draw for the tourist industry. If you question people about why they come to this state, they'll tell you it's partly to learn about its history, its past. We can't let this area of our economy slip away from us simply because we have imposed a double taxation standard on repairs and restoration.

We also need to do something about the desecration of our Indian burial grounds in our state, a very serious problem. I can't begin to tell you how huge the market is abroad for desecrated Indian graves here in this state. We are trying to develop some legislation right now on my committee to address this problem.

And the Mainstreet Program: we need to make a real and concerted effort to double the number of mainstream projects and mainstream cities in this state. I'll need your help to do that. The rural revitalization of Texas can be made possible with the Mainstreet Program. I'll hand it over to you on a silver platter; it's that simple. If you want to see its effectiveness, go to

Waxahachie or Georgetown or Center. Many of these cities in rural Texas were in decay; but the buildings have been restored and are back on the property tax rolls, contributing to our economy rather than taking from it.

I would like to make three other short recommendations that I think are very important to this state. Traveling all over this planet, meeting with ministers of culture of other nations, I have realized that we have a serious image problem. I can assure you that everywhere I went, the first question I was asked was about *Dallas*, which has yet to receive a cultural award for artistic enhancement. Texas almost needs a cabinet minister on culture—someone to help me oversee all the agencies and deal with the funding problems we have each session in the Texas House, someone that could lead cultural exchange missions to other countries, to develop dialogue, then trust, then trade. It's the cultural exchange program that starts first; that's what opens the door. Cultural exchange first, then the dialogue, then the trust and friendship—then, you can do business. We're trying to do the business first, and that's probably the reason that we haven't been so successful in our program.

You know we have a Secretary of State, a Secretary of Agriculture, a Secretary of the Treasury, and commissioners of the agencies, but we have no one designated to provide us leadership over our cultural agencies, over the cultural affairs in this state. I don't know how I can recommend this to the next session of the Legislature, but we do need a Governor's cabinet-level position that deals with cultural quality, quality of life, and with the arts organizations in this state, or we're going to lose some essential cultural resources in the funding battle.

Now, where do we get this money? I'll tell you where they took it from us in the first place—the hotel-motel tax, which was once totally dedicated to historical concerns, tourist development, and cultural arts. This tax needs to be rededicated to its original intent to generate the revenues needed for these program costs. We also must allow a greater share of the local hotel-motel tax for our

*"...we do
need a
Governor's
cabinet-
level
position
that deals
with
cultural
quality,
quality of
life, and
with the
arts organi-
zations in
this
state...."*

local cultural committees.

In all these things I've discussed, the success or failure is going to depend on you and your ability to lobby your state representative. Unlike H. Ross Perot, I don't have a big task force; when he wants to come in with his lobby group, thirty people with briefcases follow him into the room. We're on our own; we have one clerk. You'll have to deliver the vote. I'll deliver the leadership, put the issues on the table. It will depend on you and your lobbying effort, on your consolidation of that lobbying effort, on your getting to know your state representatives between now and January.

I hope you'll go home and invite them all to some cultural activity in your district. Start lobbying now, so they will understand the importance of the Panhandle Plains Museum or the Sam Houston Memorial Museum, or the cultural arts councils in the various cities across the state. If you don't do that work now, you can't expect me to be able to deliver the funding at the next session of the Legislature. It's as simple as that. In the last two sessions, we've had two miracles that have kept us in the ball park: in 1985, arts funding came through at the last minute, five minutes to twelve o'clock; in 1987, it came in a narrow-margin conference committee report.

I'm searching for the miracle in this next session—it will have to be you. If I can't get your help, the budget won't be there; if the budget is not there, the agency might not be there. Now, start now, with the planning session this afternoon. Break up into committees, design some strategies. You know who the players are. I don't want any excuses from anyone from any district—from any rep who says "I don't know anyone back in my district who ever lobbied me or worked in my campaign, or helped finance my campaign, or fought for me when I needed help." Get some chits people; we don't have any chits. It will take that to keep us in business.

You give me the chits, I'll give you the votes. Let me hear from you in January. We've got a tough job ahead of us.

UNDERSTANDING OTHER CULTURES: THE NEED FOR GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE

Francis E. Abernethy

In my rather limited academic world, "the need for global perspective" has hitherto meant a knowledge of Western civilization, and I still become pedagogically distraught when I realize students leave the university not understanding the derivations and implications of their debts to Hellenism and Hebraism. God knows we expect them to understand Homer, but we admit their main interests are Achilles' tendons and Trojans, whose towers, we remind them, eventually tumbled. American culture, the sum of all its binding experiences, has historically marched westward, looking backward to a European past. By sheer necessity we have begun to look down our shoulders to the invasions from the South, and by a sheerer necessity we are now beginning to look ahead across the Pacific at an economic jungle filled with tigers, and (to mix a metaphor) they are lined up like kids playing Red Rover. We are in the game, and they are going to come over. This puts a new perspective on global perspective. "Education for the future" will have to include the Asiatics.

Which brings us to a brief discussion of Spengler, Toynbee, and my undergraduate Latin professor, Dr. Fritz Sheley, whose name students in their youthful humor always metastasized. Dr. Sheley had amalgamated vintage anthropology with Spengler and Toynbee and had come up with a lecture on the Decline of the West and historical determinism that struck enough fear in his students to cause them to forget all they had learned about the genitive and dative, not to mention the ablative, cases.

Sheley was cadaverously tall, vulturinely stooped, and darkly browed and suited. He had a Hitlerian hair droop and paced ominously

when he was on a tutorial roll. In the Decline lecture, which was given and re-given like soap-opera flashbacks throughout the entire semester, he would begin human life in Asia with Java man, then move on to the cultures of the Yangtze, the Indus, the Tigris-Euphrates delta and the Nile, then Greece and Rome—marching doggedly and deterministically from east to west. He would roll on with a mechanistic inevitability through the Middle Ages and the Holy Roman Empire, then on to Spain, France, and the British Empire, to leap the Atlantic to come to our own time in the U.S.A. Here power would linger like a bored guest for a fleeting while and then cross the Pacific to come full circle and settle once again in Asia, the place of its beginnings. In the final phase of this chronicle Dr. Sheley would pace back and forth, shoulders stooped from the weight of his dark wisdom, hand on hernia, gazing balefully and personally on each of his students and would conclude with, "The Asiatic hordes will descend on the West like swarms of locusts to devastate the land!" Dr. Sheley taught Portuguese also, and he recommended Brazil as a good place to go when the Decline finally arrived.

Staying with Sheley, as far back as 1922 Oswald Spengler in his *Decline of the West* predicted that the generations of the twentieth century would begin seriously looking to the East as the focus of rising power, both political and economic. This was before the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere was ever mentioned. The Orient certainly did get our attention at Pearl Harbor and in Korea and in Vietnam; and the supreme political and economic irony of our time is illustrated by our secondary position in today's trade war with the East, along with the international power of the yen.

Political scientists and journalists have already named the next century as the Pacific Century, and we wonder how pacific it will be. The focus of our attention today (and our education in the future) and the Eastern cultures we most need to understand are the Tigers of Asiatic finance—Singapore, Hong Kong, Taiwan,

*"Political
scientists
and
journalists
have
already
named the
next
century as
the Pacific
Century,
and we
wonder
how pacific
it will be."*

South Korea, and Japan. Nor must we neglect China, who has lost some bamboo from her curtain and is now moving her slow thighs toward Asiatic and global involvement. And somewhere in the desert another power factor looms; it is the spread of Islam, the link between the Near and the Far East. For weal or woe these are the worlds to which we are commercially and politically bound and which we must educate ourselves to understand.

Singapore, the City of Lions (in whom the U.S. has invested heavily), is located at the tip of the Malay Peninsula; it is a twenty-six-by-fourteen mile island, one degree north of the Equator. In 1819 Sir Thomas Stamford Raffles (played by David Niven) found a small village there, and after some devious political maneuvering bought it for the British East India Company. The British Empire flourished to such an extent that within ten years England owned Singapore and had political control of the rest of the Malay Peninsula. Singapore became the major Eastern port, shipping tea, ebony, ivory, all manner of goods out of Southeast Asia and Indonesia. Singapore's economy suffered momentarily when England opened the port of Hong Kong in 1842 but accelerated again with the opening of the Suez Canal by Tyrone Power (played by Ferdinand de Lesseps) in 1869 and with the growing world market for rubber.

Today Singapore is an independent republic and claims to be the world's largest port, located at the junction of the Indian and Pacific oceans. She is the shipyard, drydock, and port for Southeast Asia and Indonesia. Oil rigs, some of which are ours, line the shore. Singapore is the third largest refining center in the world, as well as a banking and stock exchange center. And at Changi airport forty airlines have planes arriving and departing at the rate of one a minute. The Empire might have stood Singapore on its feet, but today it stands alone, rich and powerful.

Hong Kong was a haven for China Sea pirates when the British obtained it in 1842, at the end of the Opium War. In 1898 Britain signed a ninety-nine-year lease on Hong Kong Island and

the opposite peninsula. From its beginning as a British Crown Colony, Hong Kong has never lost its place as a leader in the shipping and banking world, and its location on the southeast coast of China has made it a natural way-station for all north-south shipping in the East. The largest percentage of its exports is to the U.S.A. Hong Kong ("Fragrant Harbor") will revert to China when its lease expires in 1997. What happens then is anybody's guess, but Jimmy Ho, a cynical pan-Asiatic tattoo artist whose services I once used, claimed that Hong Kong was, and always has been, a mercantile rationalization for the Chinese during their fit of Communism and would continue to be important when and if China becomes more capitalistically inclined. Hong Kong is too rich and too well established to be tossed and lost in the stew of Communism. I hold Jimmy's opinion as highly as those in *U.S. News and World Report*.

Singapore and Hong Kong owe their power and prestige to their nourishment by the British Empire. Taiwan, South Korea, and Japan owe theirs to the U.S.A. Commercial and political necessity—and a need for understanding—binds us to all of them.

Taiwan (Formosa, "the beautiful," to the sixteenth-century Portuguese) long remained a pirate refuge and fishing camp for both the Chinese and Japanese. Then in the seventeenth century, the Chinese fleeing a famine in Fukien crossed in numbers and settled and claimed it. The Japanese occupied it as a prize in 1895 after the Sino-Japanese War. From that time until the close of World War II Taiwan became a factory province, supplying Japan with rice and sugar and receiving economic assistance and protection in return. The Cairo Agreement of 1943 promised the return of Taiwan to Nationalist China on the defeat of Japan. In one of those boggling quirks of history, this island became the only thing that Nationalist China had, and Chiang Kai-Shek took his two million defeated followers there when they lost to the Communist Chinese in 1949.

The U.S. continued to support Chiang even

after the Nationalists' defeat, funneling money, supplies, and arms into the island. America's main contribution was its recognition of Nationalist China in the United Nations—that is, until we expediently reversed our position in 1972—and the patrol of the Formosan Straits, protecting them from Communist China. The U.S. gave them a stability that allowed them to use their resources in establishing a new economy. They have experienced over ten percent economic growth over the past decade, with forty-five percent of their exports being shipped to the U.S. Taiwan's currency reserve reached seventy billion in 1987, third to Japan and West Germany. For another perspective—a chilling one—consider that recently America's national debt reached well over the two-trillion mark.

The Han Chinese settled Korea in the third millennium B.C., and for millennia Korea remained the Hermit Nation, battled over by Chinese, Russians, and Japanese. In the 1943 Cairo Agreement the Allies agreed that Korea would be independent when World War II ended. At the end of the war in the Pacific, as Russia came in on August 8, 1945, the Allies agreed that Russia would accept the surrender of Japanese troops north of the thirty-eighth parallel in Korea and the U.S. would accept it south of the thirty-eighth. What began as an arbitrary line for military purposes soon became political, as Russia and the Communist party refused to relinquish control north of the thirty-eighth. In June of 1950 the North attacked with the purpose of unifying Korea and was met by forces from the United Nations, particularly the U.S. The Korean War was over in July, 1953, and a million Koreans—North and South, soldiers and civilians—were dead. South Korea was decimated, and during the decade that followed it had one of the lowest per capita incomes in the world.

Then its fortunes began to change. The cost of the war was high, but much of it had been paid for by the U.S. in Korea. The U.S. built and has maintained troops there since the war and additionally has built roads, bridges, dams, canals—everything that was blown out. By the

late 1960s the money had trickled down and around enough that some of the Koreans were starting their own businesses. They were hungry and they worked; and by the 1980s they were competing very profitably for the Yankee dollar. Now Korea's annual economic growth rate tops twelve percent, the world's highest. Their trade surplus with the U.S. is ten billion. Hyundai's Excel was the hottest import car in 1987. Daiwoo builds Pontiac's LeMans in Puchon.

Nor is North Korea starving. Assisted by China and Russia, the North Koreans have established a profitable heavy industry complex, and they look to the South for advanced technology. Korea's college generation, the ones in the streets, remember neither the war nor U.S. assistance, and they want the Americans out and the Koreas united (as do the vast majority of Koreans). We have the prospects for some sticky political problems in the Pacific Century and prospects for another super-economic power.

Japan lost the war—as well as I remember. We sailed into Nagoya harbor in September, 1945, and some of us pulled shore patrol duty in the Nagoya perimeter. Very little was left standing after that *grande finale* of bombing from Saipan, Iwo Jima, and Okinawa. Tojo's war was over, and the people were trying to find food and roofs—and they were all strangely and unsettlingly polite and passive. They began reconstruction immediately and soon began manufacturing. For years before and after the war "Made in Japan" meant tin cans stamped into flimsy toys. But the Japanese, financed by U.S. recovery programs, began to expand their industries. When Nikon cameras and lenses and Toyotas and Sonys first hit the American market, they were highly suspect; but by the mid-'70s Japanese name brands had not only found a place on American and international markets but were achieving dominance. They were cheaper than Western-made products; but more importantly, during a time when American manufacturing was at its shoddiest, Japanese products were scrupulously crafted and technically superior.

The new technologies and industries that the

"At the present time Japan has more control over the world's economy than any other power."

U.S. had established and financed in Japan were outproducing us and at this present date have cornered auto and high-tech markets all over the world. Their national income is such that they are now buying American industries, banking institutions, and real estate at a frightening rate. They spend one percent on defense. One Japanese government economist stated that Japan had the power to control the value of the U.S. dollar, our prime interest rates, and the stock exchange. An example of the imbalance of trade is that we shipped 3500 cars to Japan in the first half of 1988, and Japan shipped two million cars to the U.S. At the present time Japan has more control over the world's economy than any other power.

Lurking in the twilight is China, the sleeping giant, which might—if its present economic policies continue in a straight line—become the dominant political and economic power in the twenty-first century. Sixty years ago, in 1928, the Communist Party split off from the Nationalists. The parties came back together in '31 in their opposition to the invading Japanese, who were in their territory from then to 1945; but as soon as World War II was over they turned on each other again. Mao Te Tsung and the Communists won; Chiang Kai-Shek took his followers and went to Taiwan, futilely vowing to return and revenge. Chairman Mao put up the bamboo curtain, and the Chinese have hidden behind that wall for decades, nursing centuries-old wounds suffered under British, American, Russian, and Japanese imperialism. Isolation and a dose of Communism might have been what they needed to get them back on their feet.

Present-day China is not rich, nor is it a world power, but its people are not hungry, and the U.S. and Russia have both trod carefully, taking pains not to aggravate her. Now, after centuries of domination by imperialists and war lords—and more recently during the regressive "Cultural Revolution" by their own Gang of Four—the People's Republic of China is achieving a stability which could soon be translated into a world political and economic power. China

is a nation of tremendous natural resources not yet tapped, of cheap labor with a work force determined and willing to sacrifice for the nation's welfare. And it has the potential to begin with the best of Western and Eastern technology.

Nostradamus, the sixteenth-century astrologer, predicted that in the year 2000 A.D. a great world leader would appear out of the Orient—for what astrological prognostication is worth.

History bears me out when I say that nothing is as traumatic to the worldscape as religious enthusiasms and divine frenzies. Witness the Inquisition, the Salem Witch Trials, and Mary's burnings at Smithfield for frenzy and enthusiasm on the grand scale—and all the smaller local incidents where members were churched for dancing or where science books were burned or banned because they did not comply with entrenched fundamentalist belief.

The thoughts of such excesses make me continually and eternally grateful that the U.S. was founded by our fathers of the eighteenth century, the Neoclassical Age of Reason, the Enlightenment. Never can we revere enough the idealistic pragmatism of our Franklins and Jeffersons and Paines. And we can be equally thankful for their deistic rationalism that set the tone for our Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and Bill of Rights, and the conduct of our politics.

Which brings us to a contemporary enthusiastic phenomenon on this globe that we are forced to understand, not ignore. That is the spread of Islam. It all began simply enough with the Hegira of 622 A.D. when Mohammed fled Mecca for Medina. He considered himself to be a prophet like Abraham and Jesus, and he founded a religion for the dispossessed, where all men were equal under one God and their goal was to submit themselves and to work for God's kingdom on earth. His audience was the same as Christ's on the Mount—the poor. Islam spread northwest to the Dardanelles and southwest until it encompassed all of Mediterranean Africa and jumped the straits of Gibraltar to occupy half of Spain by the fifteenth century.

Islam has retreated some since those times of Omar Khayyam and the Arabian Nights and crusading Richard Couer de Leon, but the traditions, and the prayers, are still alive. "There is no God but Allah and Mohammed is his prophet": one does not find a *perhaps* or *maybe* here. And consider the teachings of the *Koran* (chapter 47): "When ye encounter the unbelievers, strike off their heads, until ye have made a great slaughter among them....[T]hose who fight in defense of God's true religion, he will lead them into paradise." I am not saying these pronouncements are the heart-core of all Islamic belief. Muslims have about as many sects as Protestants do, Sunni, Shiite, Baha'i, Assassin, Fatimid, Druze, Ismaili being some. And each has its own reading of the word and the traditions. But the words—some are still being said—are familiar to all Muslims, from the most docile to the Fedayeen, those ready to give their lives for paradise to come. And we must understand them—they must be a part of our education—because the long arm of Islam reaches to our real estate and our gas tanks, and even to our presidents.

Islam is the most vital and dynamic religious movement of our time. From Istanbul and North Africa through India to Malaysia and Indonesia, it is a force we and the rest of the world will have to reckon with. How does one, however, rationally understand anything as irrational as another person's religion? Islamic prominence is noticeable on university campuses, in the return to traditional dress (particularly among women) and to traditional moralities, in the building and attendance at mosques, and of course in the violence of the extremists. Islam is a Third-World religion adopted by countries who need it to bolster weak political systems and to establish identities for themselves and their people. It ministers to the weak and heavy laden and it gives them hope—through numbers and powers. Islam affords its members a framework of self-discipline and denial (Islam means "submission") for which they can expect a reward, either here or hereafter. Muslims are contenders, perhaps spoilers, and we must understand who they are

and why.

Islam is for the barefoot rather than the well-heeled, and I seriously doubt that it will have much appeal to the Asiatic economic Tigers. Nor can I see it becoming entrenched in Communist China. But it is a part of the politics of India—who is sleeping like China, but in a much more crowded bed. India, schismatized by continually warring religions, is the link between the Middle East of the oil fields and ayatollahs and the Far East of Noble House. And we are in bed with all of them.

Academic analyses of our relations with the East are common and arrive at similar conclusions, and some reflect a sorrowing, twilight sort of pessimism. I state absolutely that this is not my case nor my feeling. We study contemporary politics as a meteorologist studies temperatures and humidities and fronts, to consider the future so that we can prepare for it. A weathercaster is not being pessimistic when he says it will rain on the morrow, even if the morrow is the Fourth of July. Nor is he being negative when he deductively predicts, on the basis of accumulated knowledge, the theoretical results of acid rain or the destruction of the ozone layer.

One of America's worst mistakes was the scourging of the China Hands, the Asiatic foreign affairs officers who tried to warn Washington of Chiang's weaknesses and to explain the turn of events in post-war Asia and China under Mao. Blinded by McCarthyism and without these Eastern diplomats' understanding, we went into the knee-jerk anti-Communist reactions that even now are with us. What faces us now and in the 21st century is the need for an education to help us understand the emerging Asian nations and cultures and gain a necessarily new perspective of our position on this globe. We must compete with them and we must live with them.

The Tigers have their own problems. China, Japan, Korea, and Taiwan have a long history of enduring disputes among themselves that won't be easily or quickly resolved. The rich open U.S. market cannot endure continual bombardment, or they will kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. Too strong a yen or Singapore or Hong

*"We must
put our
students on
the racks
and stretch
their little
bodies and
minds to
cover the
globe in-
stead of
just
Western
civiliza-
tion."*

Kong dollar will diminish markets and the growing tourist trade. The cheap Asiatic work force will soon be demanding a larger part of the profits and eventually will demand a profit-sharing domestic social welfare program, maybe even from the cradle to the grave. And Karl Marx said it years ago (to give the devil his due): The seeds of the destruction of capitalism are within the system. The seeds are success, which is ultimately the most weakening of all political factors.

But for all their problems, present and future, the Asians, unlike us, are hungry now, and there is a stirring in the East, a yearning for action and a striving for achievement.

To achieve their economic goals they are exerting controls we would find difficult to tolerate. Japan's Ministry of International Trade & Industry arranges funding for growth in developing industries and sees to the quiet demise of declining ones. It promotes continual research within the industries, which promote research within themselves. Because of a lack of welfare programs, the Asiatics under discussion are forced to save, providing banks and insurance companies with money to invest in business and industry. They have a minimal defense budget. Japan—and increasingly South Korea and Taiwan—has a high-quality work force of very educated people who take nationalistic pride in their work. This is probably the most salient factor.

We are in a new game with new rules. Education for the future, understanding other cultures, and gaining global perspective are different ways of saying that we must learn the game if we are going to compete and live in harmony with the Eastern world of the 21st century. Economically, we have our problems, a main one being a staggering defense budget. Our nation is buying more than it is selling. We are spending more than we are earning, and we are saving and banking none of it. We have a work force whose salaries will not let us compete in production and whose attitudes toward its work and its product have lost the confidence of

foreign and domestic buyers. And we are falling behind in education. In a world of machines and microchips our schools are teaching watered-down courses in math, chemistry, and physics. And we are besieged by benighted fundamentalists who would have us teach primitive mythology instead of scientific biology and geology.

We have our problems, but we have our strength and our imagination and our intellect—qualities that got us into this position of Big Spender in the first place. We bankrolled the world after World War II, one reason for our present terrible indebtedness. We grubstaked Europe and Asia, and without our financial support and defense they might still be stamping out tin toys from tomato cans. But we would be idiots to think that they will thank us—we who threw out Mother England after she set us up in business, and we who threw out a Mexican government who had invited us in and had given us the best river-bottom land. We can insulate and isolate and adopt all sorts of protectionist measures against foreign imports, and we can antagonize and alienate the East and force them into other political spheres. Russia is waiting at Asia's back door, you might remember.

Or we can improve the quality of our own products, learn to produce better products more economically, and continue to market American-made products throughout Asia and the world. The Orient has money in its pockets and is already a rich market; we just have to figure out what goods or services it needs. That is one place education for the future will come in.

*Ship me somewhere east of Suez
Where the best is like the worst,
And there ain't no Ten Commandments
And a man can raise a thirst!*

Lord knows, in our search for education with an Eastern vision we cannot ignore our Western heritage and toss out Kipling and Shakespeare and Virgil. In the 21st century Europe and Africa will not fall off the map, nor will Mexico and Central and South America lapse into placid

plantation nations. Nor is Russia a figment of our imaginations. But we do have a smaller world and a looming Oriental world and a larger responsibility in education. We must put our students on the racks and stretch their little bodies and minds to cover the globe instead of just Western civilization. Public schools must teach geography, to begin with, so citizens will understand that when we refer to the East it is really on our western horizon. Universities will do well to sophisticate their own educational territories by establishing areas of Asiatic studies in history, literature, the arts, and languages. We have thousands of Oriental students in our universities learning about us, but few Americans choose to study in the East. We have now come face to face with them, West and East, and we must learn about them. We must understand their cultures—their gods and their arts and their habits, beliefs, and artifacts. Politics, economics—perhaps survival—demands it.

Fritz Sheley was right: history has come round again. Santayana and vested-interest historians are fond of saying, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." Knowing the past is kind of like Mark Twain's cat that sat on the hot stove lid. He learned not to sit on a hot stove lid again, but he wouldn't sit on a cold one either. A knowledge of the past does very little in keeping us from errors; it just helps us recognize them when they come around the second or the seventh or the seventieth time. The best that history does is to remind us that we have endured and lived through them before. West has met East before, and "education for the future" can remind us that Occidental and Oriental have one grand thing in common—humanity.

*For there is neither East nor West, border
nor breed nor birth*

*When two strong men come face to face
though they come from the ends of the
earth.*

EDUCATION FOR THE FUTURE

James F. Veninga

All too often, when it comes to discussions of education, university deans talk to university deans, college faculty members talk to college faculty members, high school teachers talk to high school teachers, museum directors talk to museum directors. Rarely do meetings bring professionals from all parts of the educational enterprise together with laypersons concerned about the issues. We need to think about life-long learning. The public librarian, the university teacher of the humanities, the high school instructor—we are all part of the educational enterprise. And we are all in pursuit of a learning society.

Fortunately there is an increasing recognition of the need to talk about content in education. While questions of finance, governance, administration, and testing are important, content—what it is that we give our fellow citizens to learn, what it is that we read and study in order to foster curiosity, imagination, and hope—is the foundation of meaningful education.

It is clear that our world is growing increasingly complex and therefore is increasingly difficult to understand. This complexity can be seen in nearly every aspect of contemporary life: in our relationship to the natural environment; in the social and personal impact of science and technology; in the implications of dramatically changing economies; in international relations; in the growth of powerful bureaucracies; in increased violence and crime; in our responsibility to human culture. Since the health and vitality of a democratic society depend on citizens who understand the world in which they live, the expansion and improvement of education must become a state and national priority.

In our seeking to expand and improve educational opportunities for all citizens, inadequate attention has been given to the humanities. The humanities are terribly undervalued and terri-

bly underfunded. A major, coordinated, and sustained effort must be made to secure adequate funding for humanities education. Private sector initiatives must be dramatically increased; but local and state funding should be expanded as well. Three important needs have surfaced already: 1) research money for college and university scholars; 2) professional opportunities such as three- or four-week summer seminars for public school teachers, giving teachers opportunities and funds for advanced study in their subject areas; 3) funds to support local projects that give life-long learning opportunities for all citizens—museum and public library programming, continuing education programs of universities, public radio and television programs, for example. Efforts such as these can lead to increased public understanding of the importance of the humanities in our schools and universities and in the culture at large.

To say that there are critical needs that have yet to be publicly acknowledged and met is not to deny the many positive developments occurring across the state. And there are, indeed, many.

I think of Lincoln King, a history instructor at Gary High School in East Texas, who has developed, with the support of a \$1,000 grant, a new interdisciplinary course in the humanities for high school seniors—a course that could be replicated in small high schools all around the state. A small amount of money goes a long way in the world of the humanities.

I think of Representative Delco's bill, passed in the last legislative session, requiring the adoption of a core curriculum in every state university—a bill that has the potential of placing Texas in a national leadership role in undergraduate education.

I think of the Abilene Committee for the Humanities, created several years ago by a group of concerned citizens eager to increase educational opportunities for adults, that is sponsoring this fall a series of programs on the history, culture, and contemporary politics of the Soviet Union.

These are the kinds of developments that we want to build on.

*"We must
work
together,
drawing
strength
from a
vision of
well
educated
citizens
participat-
ing
thought-
fully and
actively in
public life."*

If progress is to be made, we need to develop a true community of citizens concerned about education and the humanities, a community that transcends the usual divisions among groups and professions. If we are to be successful in improving public policy toward the humanities, we must develop a shared agenda and establish the machinery to get things accomplished.

The Texas Humanities Alliance provides us with the opportunity we need to bring together everyone concerned about education and lifelong learning in the humanities. We must develop a broad vision of how the many parts fit together. If one part of our enterprise suffers—funding for public libraries, for instance—we all suffer. If one part of our enterprise shows gains—improvement in the instruction of world history in our high schools, for instance—we all gain. We must work together, drawing strength from a vision of well educated citizens participating thoughtfully and actively in public life. The Texas Humanities Alliance holds great promise as an organization that brings us together to work toward the fulfillment of goals we all can support.